

Appl. No. 09/939,155

Amdt. Dated November 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office action mailed September 8, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 6-15 are pending in this application, with Claims 6 and 11 being the independent claims. No claims have been amended, and no new matter is believed to have been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 6-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenberg.

Claims 6 and 11 include transmitting from a first user a single subscribe message requesting presence info for other multiple users. Specifically, claims 6 includes the limitation "transmitting, by the first user to a presence proxy, a single subscribe message for presence information of a plurality of second users." Claim 11 includes the limitation "transmitting, by the first user to a presence proxy, a single subscribe message including an identity of a list of a plurality of second users about which presence information is sought."

Rosenberg does not disclose transmitting from a first user a single subscribe message requesting presence info for other multiple users. Rosenberg discloses an extension to SIP for subscriptions and notifications of user presence (Abstract). A subscriber, wishing to subscribe to some presentity constructs a subscribe request message (section 4.2, first paragraph). The subscribe request message is rewritten by SIP proxies as the request travels toward the recipient. Eventually, the subscribe request message is forwarded to a proxy which is co-located with a registrar (section 4.2, paragraph 9, c. page 11). A registrar is an entity in SIP that has a dynamic application layer of routing information. When a client starts up, they send the registrar a register request that binds an address in the domain of the registrar to the address of the machine on which they are residing. In fact, the binding established by a register request can be

Appl. No. 09/939,155

Amdt. Dated November 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2005

one too many, so that a user can indicate the ability to be contacted at multiple hosts (laptop, PDA, cell phone, etc.). This information is fundamentally presence, and, for that reason, the registrar can elect to act as a presence agent for this subscription. A registrar which can act as a presence agent is known as a presence server (section 4.2, paragraph 9, c. page 11).

Instead of acting as a presence agent, the presence server can act as a proxy for a subscription and forward it to a presence client. A presence client makes itself known to the presence server by registering a "contact" address that includes the methods tag of subscribe (section 4.2, paragraph 11, c. page 12). The subscribe request message must contain a "contact" header. This indicates the addresses to which the client would like to receive notifications. If the contact header contains multiple addresses, notifications will be sent to each address. If no contact header is present, no notifications will be sent (section 5.1, paragraph 11, c. page 18). If the presentity identified in the request has at least one registered contact that indicates support of the subscribe methods, the presence server may proxy the request, or may act as a presence agent. If there is more than one contact that indicates support of the subscribe method, the proxy may fork the request (i.e. send the subscription to more than one presence agent). Responses are collected and a single response is sent upstream, towards the subscriber. If more than one presence client responds with a 200 OK, only one of them is forwarded upstream. Note that this may cause multiple presence agents to generate notifications for the same presentity (section 5.4, paragraphs 4 and 5, c. page 19). Thus, as described above, the "contacts" do not refer to other users in the system. The contacts merely refer to addresses to which notifications are to be sent. Specifically, Rosenberg does not disclose transmitting from a first user a single subscribe message requesting presence info for other multiple users.

Therefore, claims 6 and 11 are not anticipated by Rosenberg because claims 6 and 11 include a limitation that is not disclosed in the Rosenberg.

Claims 7-10 and 12-15 are dependent on either claim 6 or claim 11 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 6 and 11 as stated above.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenberg.

Appl. No. 09/939,155

Amdt. Dated November 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2005

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted final Office action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 11/7/05

By: 

Mark A. Kupanoff

Reg. No. 55,349

(480) 385-5060